

**REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for examining the application, and for granting Applicants' Attorney an interview regarding the Final Office Action. Applicants have canceled claims 10, 11, 24, 25, 26, and 27, and amended claims 1, 23, 26, 48, and 49, as is discussed further below. Support for the amendment of claims 1, 23, 26, 48, and 49 may be found throughout the specification, and the amendment of claims 1, 23, 26, 48, and 49 does not constitute new matter. Applicants have also amended claims 12 and 37 to correct their dependencies, due to the canceling of claims 10, 11, 26, and 27. With the amendment, claims 1-9, 12-23, and 28-49 are now pending.

*Interview*

Applicants thank the Examiner and his Supervisor for taking the time to speak with Applicants' Attorneys regarding the current rejection. During the interview, Applicants' Attorneys argued that claim 11 is not shown by the cited art. The Examiner stated that, as discussed during the interview, the argument had merit, and the Examiner would consider it. The Examiner requested that Applicants' Attorney place the argument in writing.

Applicants have thus amended the claims as discussed during the interview, by amending claims 10 and 11 into claim 1. Applicants describe in detail below why amended claim 1 (and, more specifically, the limitations from canceled claim 11) are not shown anywhere in the cited art and are thus allowable. Applicants have also similarly amended independent claims 26, 48, and 49.

Applicants note and thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 12 may also contain allowable subject matter, though Applicants did not elect to amend claim 12 into claim 1 at this time.

Finally, Applicants also note and thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 25 (which depends from claim 23) may also include allowable subject matter. Applicants have thus amended claim 25 (and intervening claim 24) into claim 23, as is discussed further below.

Applicants request that the Examiner contact Applicants' Attorneys to discuss the case further should any issues arise.

*Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)*

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 8-11, 15-16, 18-24, 26-31, 33-36, 40-41, and 43-49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0149769 to Axberg et al.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the limitations formerly present in Applicants' dependent claims 10 and 11, respectively, each of which has been canceled. Applicants' amended independent claim 11 now requires, among other things, enabling a user to select a storage system resource of the selected vendor type; and based on a user selected storage system resource of the selected vendor type, providing a display of storage devices associated with the at least one host resource and the user selected storage system resource.

The Examiner cites to ¶¶0354-0355 and Figures 19-20 of Axberg et al. as teaching or suggesting these limitations.

However, Axberg et al. does not teach or suggest enabling a user to select a storage system resource of the selected vendor type; and based on a user selected storage system resource of the selected vendor type, providing a display of storage devices associated with the at least one host resource and the user selected storage system resource, as required by Applicants' independent claim 1.

¶¶0354-0355 of Axberg et al. read as follows:

[0354] FIG. 19 illustrates that the selection of one of the displayed LUNs, namely, the LUN having a unit number 40BFCA34, results in activation of a an Assign LUN button 116 indicating that the Assign function has been enabled. Hence, the selection of the Assign button 116 results in effecting the assignment of this LUN to the host "archi."

[0355] Alternatively, as shown in FIG. 20, the selection of the displayed LUN having a unit number AC66203, which has been previously assigned to the host archi, results in activation of the Unassign LUN button 118 and Reassign LUN button 120. The operator/administrator can select the activated Unassign function to un-assign this LUN from the host archi. Alternatively, the

operator/administrator can select the activated Re-assign function to re-assign the selected LUN to the host archi.

Applicants' amended independent claim 1, read in its entirety, requires the presence of three distinct elements: at least one host resource; at least one storage system resource, with an associated storage parameter that is a vendor type; and storage devices associated with the host resource and the storage system resource.

The Examiner argues that the at least one host resource is shown in element 110 of Figures 19/20; note that the host archi is selected.

The Examiner argues that a storage parameter including selection of a vendor type associated with a storage system resource is at least suggested by the column of the table shown in element 114 of Figures 19/20 (and related Figures, see especially Figure 22) that is entitled VENDOR. In other words, the Examiner argues that Axberg et al. at the least suggests it is possible to select a vendor type from the VENDOR column. A selected vendor type is associated with a storage system resource, that is, a LUN with a particular capacity. Further note that each row in the table of element 114 is a distinct LUN (i.e., storage system resource), and that, according to the Examiner, each LUN in the table of element 114 has a unique identifier (for example, the unit number in that column of the table shown in element 114). Finally, also note that the Examiner argues that Figures 19/20 show that it is possible for a user to select a storage system resource (i.e. LUN) of a selected vendor type.

However, nowhere in Figures 19/20, or any other Figures, or indeed any other part of Axberg et al, is a display of storage devices provided, where those storage devices are associated with the at least one host resource and the user selected storage system resource, as required by Applicants' amended independent claim 1. In other words, Axberg et al., according to the Examiner, arguably shows selecting a host resource, displaying types of storage system resources according to a selected vendor type, and then selecting a particular storage system resource, all of which are required by Applicants' amended independent claim 1. However, Axberg et al. fails to teach or even suggest based on a user selected storage system resource of the selected vendor type, providing a display of those storage devices associated with the host resource and the selected storage system resource, as also required by Applicants' amended

independent claim 1. Nowhere in Axberg et al. does Axberg et al. teach or suggest that any storage devices that comprise a storage system resource are displayed based on a user selected storage system resource of the selected vendor type. Axberg et al. only teaches that the storage system resources, and not the underlying storage devices, are displayed when a particular type of vendor is selected.

Thus, for at least any of the reasons given above, Applicants' amended independent claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Axberg et al. Therefore, Applicants' amended independent claim 1 is not obvious in light of Axberg et al., and Applicants' amended independent claim 1 is allowable over Axberg et al.

Applicants have amended independent claim 26 to include the limitations formerly present claims in Applicants' dependent claims 35 and 36, each now canceled. Applicants' amended independent claim 26 now includes limitations similar to those of Applicants' allowable amended independent claim 1. Applicants have also amended claims 48 and 49 to include limitations similar to those of Applicants' allowable amended independent claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reason(s) given above with regards to Applicants' allowable amended independent claim 1, Applicants' amended independent claims 26, 48, and 49 are themselves not obvious in light of Axberg et al., and thus, Applicants' amended independent claims 26, 48, and 49 are allowable over Axberg et al.

Applicants have also canceled dependent claims 24 and 25 and amended those claims into Applicants' independent claim 23. Applicants' amended independent claim 23 now requires, among other things, receiving a user generated selection of the at least one storage parameter in the second region, the user generated selection including: i) receiving a selection of a vendor type of storage system resource; ii) receiving a selection of a uniquely identified storage system resource of a selected vendor type in step i; and iii) receiving a selection of storage ports through which host resources access the storage devices of the uniquely identified storage system

resource of the selected vendor type. However, nowhere in Axberg et al. does Axberg et al. teach or suggest receiving a selection of storage ports through which host resources access the storage devices of the uniquely identified storage system resource of the selected vendor type, as required by Applicants' amended claim 23. For at least the reasons given above with regards to Applicants' allowable amended independent claim 1, Axberg et al. does not teach or suggest showing or displaying the storage devices of a particular storage system resource of a selected vendor type, which would be required in order for a selection of storage ports related to those storage devices to be possible. Further, no mention is made in Axberg et al. of storage ports through which host resources access the storage devices of the uniquely identified storage system resource of the selected vendor type, much less selecting such ports or receiving a selection of such ports.

Thus for at least these reasons, Applicants' amended independent claim 23 is not obvious in light of Axberg et al., and therefore Applicants' amended independent claim 23 is allowable over Axberg et al.

Applicants' dependent claims 2-6, 8-11, 15-16, 18-22, 24, 27-31, 33-36, 40-41, and 43-47 depend from, respectively, Applicants' allowable amended independent claims 1, 23, and 26. Therefore, for at least the reason(s) given above with regards to Applicants' allowable amended independent claims 1, 23, and 26, Applicants' dependent claims 2-6, 8-11, 15-16, 18-22, 24, 27-31, 33-36, 40-41, and 43-47 are themselves not obvious in light of Axberg et al., and thus, Applicants' dependent claims 2-6, 8-11, 15-16, 18-22, 24, 27-31, 33-36, 40-41, and 43-47 are allowable over Axberg et al.

The Examiner then rejected claims 7 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Axberg et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,999,179 to Kekic et al.

Applicants' dependent claims 7 and 32 depend from, respectively, Applicants' allowable amended independent claims 1 and 26. Therefore, for at least the reason(s) given above with regards to Applicants' allowable amended independent claims 1 and

26, Applicants' dependent claims 7 and 32 are themselves not obvious in light of Axberg et al. in view of Kekic et al., and thus, Applicants' dependent claims 7 and 32 are allowable over the combination of Axberg et al. with Kekic et al.

The Examiner next rejected claims 12 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Axberg et al. in view of Person ("Using the AutoFilter", Special Edition Using Microsoft Excel 97, Que, December 17, 1996, pgs. 1-17) (hereinafter "Person").

Applicants' dependent claims 12 and 37 depend from, respectively, Applicants' allowable amended independent claims 1 and 26. Therefore, for at least the reason(s) given above with regards to Applicants' allowable amended independent claims 1 and 26, Applicants' dependent claims 12 and 37 are themselves not obvious in light of Axberg et al. in view of Person, and thus, Applicants' dependent claims 12 and 37 are allowable over the combination of Axberg et al. with Person.

The Examiner then rejected claims 13-14, 25, and 38-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Axberg et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,009,466 A to Axberg et al. (hereinafter "Axberg et al. 2").

Applicants' dependent claims 13-14, 25, and 38-39 depend from, respectively, Applicants' allowable amended independent claims 1, 23, and 26. Therefore, for at least the reason(s) given above with regards to Applicants' allowable amended independent claims 1, 23, and 26, Applicants' dependent claims 13-14, 25, and 38-39 are themselves not obvious in light of Axberg et al. in view of Axberg et al. 2, and thus, Applicants' dependent claims 13-14, 25, and 38-39 are allowable over the combination of Axberg et al. with Axberg et al. 2.

The Examiner then rejected claims 17 and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Axberg et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,060,135 to Levine et al.

Applicants' dependent claims 17 and 42 depend from, respectively, Applicants' allowable amended independent claims 1 and 26. Therefore, for at least the reason(s)

given above with regards to Applicants' allowable amended independent claims 1 and 26, Applicants' dependent claims 17 and 42 are themselves not obvious in light of Axberg et al. in view of Levine et al., and thus, Applicants' dependent claims 17 and 42 are allowable over the combination of Axberg et al. with Levine et al.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe this Amendment and Response to be fully responsive to the present Office Action. Thus, based on the foregoing Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request allowance of the application.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is any fee occasioned by this response that is not paid, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

Should the enclosed papers or fees be considered incomplete, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office contact the undersigned collect at the telephone number provided below.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned Attorney if any issues are deemed to remain prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/SPM/

Shaun P. Montana, Esq.  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No.: 54,320  
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC  
Westborough Office Park  
1700 West Park Drive  
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581  
Telephone: (508) 616-9660  
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: EMC04-07(04091)

Dated: November 19, 2007